

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

David Bacchus,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 6:09-1226-HMH-KFM
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
Major Dean, Associate Warden Bell,)	
and Investigator Greer,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ David Bacchus (“Bacchus”), a state prisoner proceeding pro se, brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging various violations to his civil rights. In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends that the Defendants’ motion and supplemental motion for summary judgment be granted and Bacchus’ motions for summary judgment be denied.

Bacchus filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce,

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Bacchus' objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald's Report and Recommendation.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the Defendants' motion and supplemental motion for summary judgment, docket numbers 30 and 77, are granted; it is further

ORDERED that Bacchus' motions for summary judgment, docket numbers 47, 68, and 97, are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
July 28, 2010

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.